

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This application was previously subject to a Notice of Appeal. Appellant by this paper withdraws such Notice and requests continued examination of the application in view of the amendments entered and remarks made herein.

Prior to any amendments made herein, claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15-16 and 18-24 were pending in the application. Claims 3, 14 and 17 were previously cancelled. All of the pending claims are rejected under 35 USC § 103. As explained further below, Appellant respectfully traverses.

Claim Amendments

By this Response, clarifying amendments are made to claims 1, 12 and 24. Support for the amendments is provided throughout the application, including at paragraphs [0030], [0041] and [0045] of the application as originally filed. Claims 25 and 26 have been added. Support for these additional claims is provided throughout the application, including at paragraph [0030] of the application as originally filed.

Appellant notes that each and every amendment and argument entered herein is made in view of the particular circumstances surrounding the application at this point in time, and, in view of such circumstances, in the interest of advancing examination of the case. Appellant expressly reserves the right to disclaim any or all such amendments and/or arguments in subsequent prosecution, in the interest of recapturing, upon entry of such disclaimer, any disclaimed claim scope. Appellant respectfully suggests to the Examiner that it may be necessary to, and hereby requests that in fact the Examiner do, revisit and reconsider all art cited against the claims in previous prosecution, in case any amendment made herein re-opens any question of the applicability of such art.

Summary of Interview

Appellant thanks the Examiner for her time and insight during the interviews conducted with Appellant's attorneys, Matthew Marquardt and Signe Silver, on November 12, 2009 and November 20, 2009.

On November 12, 2009, claim 1 of the current application was discussed and Appellant's attorneys explained their view of how the current invention was distinguishable from the cited prior art. Appellant's attorneys suggested that proposed clarifying amendments could be forwarded to the Examiner and the Examiner kindly agreed to discuss the proposed amendments.

On November 20, 2009, proposed amendments were discussed. The proposed amendments submitted to the Examiner at that time differed from the currently-submitted amendments only in terms of semantics and the inclusion of claims 25 and 26 submitted herewith.

The Examiner agreed that the proposed amended claims more accurately expressed the differences between the current application and the cited art and that, if the amended claims were to be submitted along with a request for continued examination, it would be appropriate to conduct a renewed search.

Again, Appellant thanks the Examiner for her time and insight.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

In the Final Office Action dated June 5, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15, 16, and 18-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,049,796 to Siitonen et al. ("Siitonen") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,950,988 to Hawkins et al. ("Hawkins") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0155908 to Wagner ("Wagner") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,295,852 to Davis et al. ("Davis").

As discussed during the telephone interviews of 12 and 20 November 2009, Appellant believes that the claims as currently presented are distinguished from the cited art at least in that: devices according to the invention provide "at least two distinct communications capabilities"; devices according to the invention provide interfaces configured "to provide at least one main screen adapted for invoking a plurality of applications, the plurality of applications comprising applications for controlling the at least two communications capabilities"; and such "at least one main screen comprises an application portion displaying one or more application icons operable to invoke the plurality of applications".

Appellant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

CONCLUSION

Appellant believes that it has responded to each ground of rejection raised by the Examiner, and that for at least the reasons cited above the claims, as presented, are in condition for immediate allowance. Appellant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims.

Appellant is concerned to advance this application as quickly as is reasonably possible. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests that, in the event the Examiner has any further questions about this application, the Examiner call Appellant's attorney at the number provided below.

Appellant believes that no further fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper. In the event that the office determines that any further fee is due, Appellant requests that such fee be charged to its Deposit Account No. 195113.

Appellant requests that any questions concerning this matter be directed to the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

OGILVY RENAULT LLP

Date: May 13, 2010

By: /cyw/

Christine Wong
Registration No. 62,935
Tel: (416) 216-1874
Fax: (416) 216-3930

OGILVY RENAULT LLP
Suite 3800, Royal Bank Plaza, South Tower
200 Bay Street, P.O. Box 84
Toronto, ON M5J 2Z4
Canada